IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S.ANANDA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO : 7359 of 1997

Between:

A. Narsinga rao S/o.Satyanarayana
R/o.Jaggayyapalem Visakhapatnam District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

State Bank of India, Personal Section, Zonal Office,
Rep by its Zonal Officer,
Visakhapatnam -530 020.

.....RESPONDENT

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue any writ, order or direction more particularly a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondent not to take up the 1991 select of Messengers till 1989 list is exhausted in respect of absorption on permanent basis and further direction to take steps provide livelihood to the Petitioner on permanent basis and by keeping the 1989 list live.

Counsel for the Petitioner: DR. P. B. VIJAYA KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondent: MR. K. SRINIVASAMURTHY

The Court made the following:

-

-

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed by the petitioner, who claimed to have worked for a period of 74 days from 01-01-1986 to 31-12-1986 and from 01-01-1987 to 31-12-1987 as per the certificate given by the Bank, which was annexed as annexure No.1 to the writ petition.

2. It is also stated that as per the settlement between the respondent Bank and the Union of the employees, a notification was issued inviting applications from all the temporary employees, who worked from
01-07-1975 to 31-07-1988, and accordingly the authorities prepared a panel. But the grievance of the petitioner is that though his name was included in the panel, prepared in the year 1989 for absorption, without exhausting the said panel, a fresh panel has been prepared in the year 1991, and the respondent Bank was proceeding for absorption of the candidates enlisted in the year 1991 panel. Therefore, the petitioner has come up with the present writ petition.

3. At the time of hearing it is represented by the learned Counsel for the petitioner that a Batch similar writ petitions were disposed of by this Court in **M. RAJAIAH AND OTHERS VS. SBI CENTRAL OFFICE, MUMBAI** (W.P.NOS.9206 OF 1997 AND BATCH DATED 01-01-1998) and as per the directions passed in the said batch of writ petitions, the petitioner is entitled for absorption and, therefore, the learned Counsel sought for a similar direction.

4. Though the respondents are being represented by their Counsel but, however, the learned Counsel stated that he does not have the bundle, and, therefore, he could not assist the Court. But in view of the fact that an Order has been passed in a Batch of writ petitions referred to above, this Court is inclined to dispose of the writ petition

on the same lines. Accordingly, the respondent bank is directed to apply the directions contained in the said Order passed in the above Batch of writ petitions and extends the benefits as per the said Order by implementing the directions to the petitioner herein.

5. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of with the above said directions. No costs.

_____

S. ANANDA REDDY, J

Dt.23-09-2004

Glv/Kvh

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

// TRUE COPY //

SECTION OFFICER

Copies to

1. The Zonal Officer, State Bank of India,
Personal Section, Zonal Office Visakhapatnam -530 020.

2. Two CD copies